

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached replacement drawing sheets make changes to Figs. 15, 19, 26 and 28 and replace the original sheets with Figs. 15, 19, 26 and 28.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets

REMARKS

Claims 1-27 are pending. By this Amendment, claims 1, 9-11 and 18 are amended, and claims 24-27 are added. In addition, the title is amended and typographical errors in the drawings are corrected. Independent claims 1 and 9-11 are amended to even more clearly distinguish over the applied references. Support for the features added to claims 1 and 9-11 and support for the features recited in new claims 24-27 are supported throughout the specification (see, for example, Figs. 1 and 2 and their corresponding disclosure). Claim 18 is amended to be consistent with its amended independent claim. Thus, no new matter is added by the above amendments.

I. Information Disclosure Statement

The Examiner is requested to consider the information submitted with the Information Disclosure Statement that was filed on January 31, 2006.

II. All Informalities Have Been Corrected

The Office Action identified a typographical error in Fig. 15. By this Amendment, that typographical informality and additional typographical informalities in the drawings have been corrected. In particular: (i) the spelling of "deleting" and "protected" in step S521 of Fig. 15 is corrected; (ii) the spelling of "termination" in step S22 of Fig. 19 is corrected; (iii) the spelling of "selection" in step S61 and "search" in step S69 of Fig. 26 is corrected; and (iv) the spelling of "enabling" in step S81, "changed" in step S86, "lapse of time" in step S88 and "change" in step S94 of Fig. 28 is corrected.

Applicants submit that the amendment to the title overcomes the objection to the title.

III. All Pending Claims Are Patentable

The Office Action objected to claims 15 and 22, alleging that there is not support for the feature that a detector detects a start of transmission of the digital images. Applicants respectfully traverse this objection. The original specification and drawings support claims

15 and 22. For example, paragraph [0067] indicates that data can be transmitted automatically when the camera is placed on the docking station, and paragraphs [0096] - [0098] and Fig. 6 describe that communication between the camera on the docking station and the image storage is detected. Withdrawal of the objection is requested.

Claims 1, 7, 10, 12-15 and 17-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over JP-A-8-69684 (Chatani). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Chatani does not disclose or suggest an arrangement in which digital images are transmitted from a digital camera mounted on a docking station to a storage medium that is disposed in a housing that is separate from a housing having the docking station, as recited in independent claims 1 and 10. Housing 1 of Chatani includes the docking station and the storage medium. Accordingly, these claims along with their dependent claims are patentable over Chatani. Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Independent claims 9 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Chatani in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,580,460 to Takahashi et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claims 9 and 11 are patentable for the same reasons set forth above with respect to independent claims 1 and 10. That is, neither Chatani nor Takahashi et al. discloses or suggests an arrangement in which digital images are transmitted from a digital camera mounted on a docking station to a storage medium that is disposed in a housing that is separate from a housing having the docking station. Accordingly, independent claims 9 and 11, along with their dependent claims, are patentable over Chatani and Takahashi et al. Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Claims 2-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Chatani in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,602,458 to Dowe. Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Chatani in view of Dowe and further in view of Takahashi et al. Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Chatani in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,844,400 to Ramsier et al.

Claims 16 and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Chatani in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,135,809 to Asakawa. Neither, Dowe, Takahashi et al., Ramsier et al. nor Asakawa overcomes the deficiencies noted above in Chatani. Accordingly, these claims are patentable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to their corresponding independent claims. Withdrawal of the rejections is requested.

Applicants submit that newly-added dependent claims 24-27 are patentable over the applied references in view of the patentability of their corresponding independent claims and for the features recited in these new dependent claims.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Mario A. Costantino
Registration No. 33,565

MAC/ccs

Attachments:

Amendment Transmittal
Replacement Sheets

Date: February 28, 2006

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--